DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 100 925 95 SP 008 855

AUTHOR Comeaux, Pamela Harris
TITLE A Followup Study of 1967-70 Cooperative Urban Teacher Education Graduates.
INSTITUTION Mid-Continent Regional Educational Lab., Inc., Kansas City, Mo.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE 71
CONTRACT OEC-3-7-062876-3076
NOTE 17p.; Filmed from Best Copy Available

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.75 HC-$1.50 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS Career Choice; College Graduates; *Followup Studies; Program Evaluation; Public Schools; Student Characteristics; Student Teaching; *Teacher Education; *Urban Education; *Urban Environment; *Urban Teaching
IDENTIFIERS *Cooperative Urban Teacher Education Program

ABSTRACT

The Cooperative Urban Teacher Education (CUTE) program enrolled 295 volunteer teachers in their senior year of college and trained them for one semester in an inner-city school. The program, operating from the fall of 1967 through spring 1970, included three components: sociology, mental health, and teacher education. The 1971 follow-up study of the CUTE program collected employment data from the 295 CUTE and 231 comparison graduates. Data indicated that a significantly greater proportion of the female graduates of the CUTE program teach in inner-city schools and plan to teach in the inner-city schools in the future. A significantly greater proportion of male CUTE graduates remain in the inner-city school. Subjective comments indicate CUTE graduates consider the training program to be a valuable teaching experience. (MJM)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ED 100 925

A Followup Study of 1967-70 Cooperative Urban Teacher Education Graduates

by

Pamela Harris Comeaux

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Mid-continent Regional Educational Laboratory

Kansas City, Missouri

1971

SP008 855

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Published by the Mid-continent Regional Educational Laboratory, a private nonprofit corporation supported in part as a regional educational laboratory by funds from the United States Office of Education, Department of Health, Education and Welfare under contract number OEC-3-7-062876-3076. The opinions expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the Office of Education and no official endorsement by the Office of Education should be inferred.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Summary	1
The Locale	2
Needs Assessment	2
Historical Background	2
Scope of the Followup	3
Procedures	4
Evaluation	4
Participants	4
Measuring Changes	6

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLES

1	CUTE Graduates - Number and Location	5
2	Comparison Graduates - Number and Location	5
3	Distribution of Responses from CUTE and Comparison Graduates	6
4	Frequency Distribution of Employment Categories for Male CUTE and Comparison Graduates	6
5	Frequency Distribution of Employment Categories for Female CUTE and Comparison Graduates	7
6	Occupations of Nonteaching Male Graduates	7
7	Occupations of Nonteaching Female Graduates	8
8	Future Plans of the Male Inner City Teacher Respondents	8
9	Future Plans of the Female Inner City Teacher Respondents	9
10	Future Teaching Plans of Male Respondents Not Currently Teaching in the Inner City	9
11	Future Teaching Plans of Female Respondents Not Currently Teaching in the Inner City	9
12	Distribution of Employment Categories for Three-year CUTE Graduates	10
13	Distribution of Employment Categories for Two-year CUTE Graduates	10

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Summary

The 1971 followup study of the Cooperative Urban Teacher Education program had two main objectives: 1) to determine if a greater percentage of CUTE graduates were teaching in the inner city than comparison group graduates and 2) to determine if CUTE graduates who began their teaching careers in inner city schools continued teaching in the inner city.

From the fall 1967 through the spring 1970 semesters, the CUTE program trained 295 student teachers and tested 231 comparison student teachers. The CUTE program enrolls volunteer student teachers in their senior year of college and trains them for one semester in an inner city school. The program includes three components: sociology, mental health and teacher education. Sociology and mental health training are based on the specific problems of minority groups. The teacher education component stresses reflective teaching skills.

CUTE operated in four school systems: Kansas City, Missouri; Kansas City, Kansas; Oklahoma City, Oklahoma and Wichita, Kansas. The program was conducted by a team of educators comprised of an elementary education instructor, a secondary education instructor, a sociologist and a mental health specialist. The course included a sociological study of the inner city with field experience in the inner city, psychological lectures on the nature of the learner and the study and practice of teaching techniques. The majority of CUTE and comparison student teachers were from similar socioeconomic backgrounds. Both groups requested the inner city area for their student teaching experience.

To measure the effectiveness of the program, employment data were collected from the CUTE and comparison graduates. Data show that a significantly greater proportion of the female graduates of the CUTE program 1) teach in the inner city, and 2) plan to teach in the inner city in the future. A significantly greater proportion of male CUTE graduates remain in the inner city. Subjective comments indicate CUTE graduates consider the training program their "most valuable" teaching experience.

The program's high retention rate of teachers for inner city schools justifies the recommendation that such a program could well be funded and installed in any city having a depressed inner city area represented in its school system.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

and Nebraska. Also in June, the National Defense Education Act Institute was funded to improve programs for personnel preparing to teach disadvantaged youth. Colleges and universities were invited to cooperate with school districts in developing a national program to:

1. Identify important issues in the preparation of teachers for the disadvantaged.

2. Clarify basic assumptions about the best way of solving intercultural issues and the implications of this work for the training of teachers of the disadvantaged.

3. Conduct pilot projects or training programs for handling these issues.

At this time the director of the Central Missouri State College Inner City Teacher Education project joined the Mid-continent Regional Educational Laboratory. He began discussing the problem of inner city teachers with representatives of private liberal arts colleges and soon realized that these colleges enrolled a large untapped source of potential inner city teachers.

Representatives of 13 liberal arts colleges, the school systems of Kansas City, Missouri and Kansas City, Kansas and the Mid-continent Regional Educational Laboratory met in the summer of 1966. They unanimously desired to develop a cooperative program and submitted a proposal to the NDEA Institute for funds, adopted a name and began the organizational structure. Each participating institution provided one representative to the Central Urban Teacher Education committee which developed the program, determined policies and selected the instructional staff and student teachers.

The first semester work began in the fall of 1967 with 22 students. During 1967, three additional liberal arts and two state-supported universities joined the group.

The program was originally funded by a $12,000 planning grant from the NDEA Institute for Advanced Study in Teaching Disadvantaged Youth, a $15,000 grant from the Danforth Foundation, tuition rebates by participating colleges, support from the two Kansas City school systems, the Mid-continent Regional Educational Laboratory and the Multi-purpose Training Center at the University of Missouri, Kansas City. Some of these resources continue to be available for inner city education.

Scope of the Followup

The CUTE program is designed for one 16-week semester in which students normally enroll for student teaching. The followup is based on data obtained from graduates of the program and comparison groups. They are grouped by school year rather than semester.

During the 1967-68 school year, 40 student teachers were trained in the Kansas City, Missouri CUTE program and 34 student teachers participated

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

in the comparison group. During the 1968-69 school year, 105 student teachers were trained with the CUTE program in Kansas City, Missouri; Oklahoma City, Oklahoma and Wichita, Kansas. There were 82 comparison student teachers at the three sites. During the 1969-70 school year, 150 students participated in the CUTE program and 115 students were in the comparison groups in the inner city areas of the three locations.

Procedures

This report is a followup study of CUTE and comparison student teachers who participated in the program from fall, 1967 through spring, 1970. Because the CUTE program was in the developmental stages until the operational test in the fall of 1970, modifications in the program were made as the result of ongoing evaluations throughout the first three years. Testing instruments were changed as the focus of program components were altered; therefore, uniform statistical data were not available for the followup.

Evaluation

The Cooperative Urban Teacher Education program was developed by the Mid-continent Regional Educational Laboratory in 196' as a result of the recognized shortage of trained teachers willing to work with the unique culture and environment of the inner city or economically underprivileged areas. Objectives of the followup report are to determine:

1. If a greater percentage of CUTE graduates were teaching in the inner city than comparison group graduates.

2. If CUTE graduates who begin their teaching careers in inner city schools remain there.

Participants

This study consisted of CUTE students who had been graduated from the program for one, two or three years. Graduates who participated in comparison testing while student teaching in the inner city were also part of this study and like CUTE students had been graduated for one, two or three years. The number of graduates participating in each year is shown in Tables 1 and 2.

The majority of CUTE participants have middle-class, white, Protestant backgrounds with little exposure to minority group people or poverty conditions. They came to the program voluntarily, apparently with a common social commitment to teach the economically underprivileged child of the ghetto area.

Members of the comparison group have backgrounds similar to CUTE participants. They also requested the inner city area for their student teaching experience, but did not receive additional training. Approximately 20 percent of both groups were male.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE 1

CUTE Graduates - Number and Location

CUTE	1967-68	1968-69	1969-70
Kansas City	(1 & 2) 40 students	(3 & 4) 48 students	(5 & 6) 37 students
Oklahoma City		(1) 30 students	(2 & 3) 47 students
Wichita		(1) 27 students	(2 & 3) 66 students
	40 students	105 students	150 students
			TOTAL 295 students

TABLE 2

Comparison Graduates - Number and Location

Comparison	1967-68	1968-69	1969-70
Kansas City	(Comp 2)* 34 students	(Comp 3&4) 47 students	(Comp 5&6) 39 students
Oklahoma City		(Comp 1) 9 students	(Comp 3)* 9 students
Wichita		(Comp 1) 26 students	(Comp 2&3) 67 students
	34 students	82 students	115 students
			TOTAL 231 students

*There were no comparison students for the KC CUTE 1 or OKC CUTE 2 students.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Data Collection:

To determine the effects of the program on influencing student teachers to enter into and remain in inner city schools, a Questionnaire on Employment Status (see appendix) was sent to CUTE graduates in March, 1971. At that time identical questionnaires were sent to graduates who participated in comparison groups while student teaching in the inner city. A followup letter and questionnaire were mailed to graduates who had not responded by the end of April. During the last of May and the first of June, graduates who had still failed to respond were contacted by phone and employment data completed at that time.

The frequency of responses for CUTE and comparison graduates is shown in Table 3.

TABLE 3 Distribution of Responses from CUTE and Comparison Graduates

	CUTE	Comparison*	Total
Male students	68	32	100
Female students	209	146	355
TOTAL	277	178	455

*OKC Comparison Group not represented.

Ninety-four percent of the CUTE graduates responded to the QES. Twenty-five percent of these respondents were male. Eighty-four percent of the comparison graduates responded and 18 percent of these graduates were male. The Oklahoma City comparison groups were omitted from the analysis due to the small number of total and participating graduates.

Table 4 contains employment categories for the male CUTE and comparison graduates.

TABLE 4 Frequency Distribution of Employment Categories for Male CUTE and Comparison Graduates

	Teaching				Not	
	Inner City	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Teaching	TOTAL
CUTE	21	10	5	4	28	68
Comparison	11	4	1	3	13	32

Fifty-nine percent of the male graduates of both groups were teaching during the 1970-71 school year. Fifty-three percent of the CUTE and 58 percent of the comparison male graduates who taught were located in the inner city.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Twenty-five percent of the male CUTE graduates who were teaching were located in urban schools, 12 percent in suburban and 10 percent in rural schools. Twenty-one percent of the comparison male graduates who were teaching were located in urban schools, 5 percent in suburban and 16 percent in rural schools.

Employment categories for the female graduates are shown in Table 5.

TABLE 5 Frequency Distribution of Employment Categories for Female CUTE and Comparison Graduates

	Teaching				Not	
	Inner City	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Teaching	TOTAL
CUTE	77	23	29	23	57	209
Comparison	31	27	24	25	39	146

Seventy-three percent of the female participants of both groups taught in 1970-71. Fifty-one percent of the female CUTE graduates who were teaching taught in the inner city as compared with 29 percent of the female comparison graduates. A test for Significance of Difference Between Two Proportions revealed in this to be significantly different at the .05 level of confidence. Fifteen percent of the teaching CUTE female graduates were located in urban schools, 19 percent in suburban and 15 percent in rural schools. Twenty-five percent of the female members of the comparison group were teaching in urban, 22 percent in suburban and 24 percent in rural schools. None of these differences were significant.

Forty-one percent of the male CUTE and 41 percent comparison graduates who responded to the QES did not teach during the 1970-71 school year. Table 6 contains the occupations of those graduates.

TABLE 6 Occupations of Nonteaching Male Graduates

	Armed Forces	Related Fields	Graduate School	Other	TOTAL
CUTE	13	4	4	7	28
Comparison	3	2		8	13

The "other" category includes clerk, insurance, sales work and other vocations totally unrelated to education. Related fields include social and welfare work, poverty programs, the Peace Corps, adult urban education and educational programs for other minority groups such as American Indians and Eskimos.

The armed forces claimed 46 percent and 23 percent of the nonteaching CUTE and comparison males. This proportion of CUTE males was significantly different at the .05 level of confidence. Fourteen percent of the CUTE

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Forty percent of the CUTE male and 24 percent of the comparison males not presently teaching in the inner city stated their desire to do so in the future. Twenty percent of the CUTE and 38 percent of the comparison male participants stated they had no plans for inner city teaching. Forty percent of the male CUTE respondents were not certain about future inner city teaching as compared to 38 percent of the male comparison members.

Sixty-seven percent of the female CUTE respondents and 47 percent of the female comparison group indicated that they intend to teach in the inner city in the future. A test for Significance of Difference Between Two Proportions revealed this to be significantly different at the .05 level of confidence. Only 16 percent of the female CUTE participants stated they had no plans for inner city teaching as compared with 36 percent of the female comparison graduates. Again this proportion was significantly different at the .05 level of confidence. Sixteen percent of the CUTE and 17 percent of the comparison females were uncertain about future plans.

Table 12 shows employment categories for KC 1 and 2 CUTE students. They have been graduated from the program for three years.

Completed data were not available for the 1969 and 1971 followup. However, the data in Table 12 suggested a small loss of teachers from the inner city area.

TABLE 12

Distribution of Employment Categories for Three-year CUTE Graduates

	1969	1970	1971
Teaching			
Inner City	14	14	9
Urban	3	3	6
Suburban	3	5	6
Rural	1	7	3
Not Teaching	1	11	11
TOTAL	22	40	35

Kansas City CUTE 3 and 4, Oklahoma City 1 and Wichita 1 groups have been graduated for two years. Results of the 1970 followup study are compared with 1971 in Table 13.

TABLE 13

Distribution of Employment Categories for Two-year CUTE Graduates

	1970	1971
Teaching		
Inner City	44	41
Urban	7	8
Suburban	10	15
Rural	6	8
Not Teaching	37	29
TOTAL	104	101

Three KC 3 and 4 CUTE graduates could not be located this year. However, of the responding graduates there was a net loss of only three teachers from the inner city area from 1970 to 1971.

The final portion of the Questionnaire on Employment Status provided space for additional comments. Fifty-three percent of the male and female CUTE graduates and 29 percent of the male and female

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

comparison graduates did respond. Most of the comments pertained to education in general with emphasis on conditions of and attitudes about the inner city.

None of the CUTE graduates made negative remarks about the inner city or stated they were unable to cope with the unique problems found in inner city schools. All negative comments were aimed toward the traditional educational system or administrators and their lack of support and understanding. For example, one Kansas City female graduate said,

> Administrators need CUTE training as well. They don't understand the strong connection between the child's school and home environment.

A Wichita female CUTE graduate stated,

> My biggest disappointment has been the apathy of school officials towards inner city schools....In my wing of six young teachers I am the only one returning. This is indicative of the whole school.

Many CUTE graduates mentioned the unfortunate lack of communication among the faculty.

> ...The problems I encountered were nearly insurmountable only because there was little help from the administration and nothing but bitterness among the faculty with no communication....Often I would think, if only the whole group could have experienced a program like CUTE....(Oklahoma City male CUTE graduate.)

Nearly every CUTE graduate made positive statements about the program: its staff, aims or objectives. They were indebted to CUTE training and even those who were not teaching in the inner city felt their CUTE experience was very worthwhile. One male Oklahoma City graduate made this comment,

> Although I may never teach in an inner city public school, my semester as a CUTE teacher was invaluable. I hope I will now find many ways in which I can personally help to close the gaps between the inner city and the middle class suburbia.

A female graduate of the first Kansas City CUTE group said,

> I can never put into words how much I gained from the CUTE program. It awakened me to the world around me.

A male graduate of the first Wichita CUTE group stated,

> CUTE gave me the fundamentals and basic understandings needed for *any* teaching job.

In contrast, the majority of comparison graduates who made additional comments expressed fear of the inner city and said it was just "Too mentally and physically exhausting." A female Oklahoma City comparison graduate responded,

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

> No, I hope never to teach in an inner city school simply because I do not wish to cope with the unbearable situations which I know arise. I have several good friends who were put in the inner city school system without choice and all are overwhelmed, exhausted and many discouraged with the whole profession of teaching.

Many graduates suggested more extensive training and more experience as two necessary prerequisites for teaching in an inner city school.

> Inner city schools are too mentally and physically exhausting. I need more, much more experience before I'd tackle the inner city. (Kansas City female comparison graduate.)

Other negative comments were related to the large amount of discipline problems encountered in inner city areas.

> I do not ever plan to teach in the inner city until I would have the backing of the school system on discipline. I did want to teach in the inner city until I student taught there. After the experience I had with my supervising teacher I wouldn't have taught at all if I hadn't already signed my contract to teach the first year after graduation. (Male Kansas City comparison graduate.)

Comparison graduates also expressed disappointment with administrators in the school system...

> I taught last year in an inner city school in Connecticut. I quit because of the administration there. (Female Kansas City comparison graduate.)

Another Kansas City comparison graduate (male) who was leaving the inner city made this statement,

> Differences with the administration; a lack of confidence in the Board; rising fear of personal harm from unknown students and nonstudents; a lack of organization; problems which make smoking, fighting and disrespect and defiance of authority too trivial to be of concern; and pressure from faculty and students for a black faculty are contributing factors in my decision to 'run to suburbia.'

Although the additional comments given by both CUTE and comparison graduates were subjective, they appear to illustrate the contrasting attitudes held by the two groups toward the inner city. One statement made by a CUTE (female) graduate seems to represent the feelings of most of the graduates,

> I am in my second year in the inner city and will leave only if I am *put out*. I love it and the children very much. I am now living in the community in which I work.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

A Kansas City comparison graduate now employed as an insurance underwriter made this comment,

> I found that I did not have sufficient patience to cope with the difficult educational challenges of the inner city youth. I've changed to a job where I can see more immediate results for my efforts.

Reporting Findings

The analysis of data from the 1971 followup of the Cooperative Urban Teacher Education program strongly illustrates the success of the program. A significantly greater proportion of female CUTE versus female comparison graduates are:

1. Teaching in the inner city.
2. Planning to teach in the inner city in the future.
3. Attending graduate school.
4. Employed in fields related to the economically underpriviledged areas of the inner city.

A significantly greater proportion of male CUTE versus male comparison graduates are:

1. Going to remain in inner city schools.
2. Attending graduate school.

It is evident that the CUTE program has repeatedly been successful training student teachers who choose to teach in and remain in inner city schools, thus meeting the two objectives. Many of these graduates who are not teaching in the inner city are employed in related fields, thus fulfilling their commitment to the economically underpriviledged areas in comparable ways.

Subjective comments represent contrasting attitudes of CUTE and comparison graduates towards the culture of the inner city. CUTE graduates continually expressed more acceptance, understanding and tolerance for the unique problems found in the inner city.

As indicated earlier, both CUTE and comparison participants voluntarily requested the inner city area for student teaching. Both groups had eight weeks student teaching experience. The majority of CUTE and comparison members came from middle-class, white, Protestant backgrounds with little exposure to minority group people or poverty conditions. Approximately 10 percent of the groups were black.

The evaluation of this program represents graduates from three different locations over a three-year span of time. There is little doubt that the program has had a major influence on participating CUTE students. The

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

program has begun operation in other cities and has received national recognition as one of the most valuable to improve inner city education.

In 1969 the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education awarded CUTE exemplary recognition for its successful program in training systems for future inner city classroom teachers.

The Cooperative Urban Teacher Education program was cited by the United States Commissioner of Education in *The Education Professions, 1969-70.* The annual report names CUTE as one of three innovative programs "that have made outstanding attempts to bring together many of the elements necessary for a realistic, practical preparation for teachers of the economically disadvantaged."

In 1970 the U.S. Office of Education together with Educational Testing Service recognized CUTE as one of five highly successful federally funded research and development programs.

In 1971 four program sites were implementing continuing operations for training inner city educators: Oklahoma City, Kansas City, Omaha and Wichita. New organizational efforts are being explored which will make the CUTE system available for many more users. In addition, McREL is developing and testing new instructional systems suitable for pre and inservice teacher training for the urban disadvantaged education community.

The widespread recognition of CUTE as well as the results of the followup report strongly illustrate the success of the program.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

APPENDIX

Questionnaire on Employment Status

Name_____ Date_____

Home Address_____

Home Phone_____

Respond only to those which apply to you:

1. You *are* teaching in the following type of school:

   _____ inner city

   _____ urban

   _____ suburban

   _____ rural

2. If you are teaching in an inner city school, do you intend to remain there?_____

3. If you plan to leave, is it because you do not like teaching in inner city schools?_____

4. If not, why do you plan to leave?_____

5. If you *are not* teaching at the present time, what is your occupation?

6. If you are not teaching in an inner city school, or if you are engaged in some other occupation, do you hope to be able to teach in the inner city in the future? If not, what are some of your reasons?

7. Additional comments._____